

R E M A R K S

Claims 6, 7, 13, 14 and 20-33 are in the application, with Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20 and 21 having been amended, with Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15-19 having been cancelled, and with Claims 22-33 having been added.

Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20 and 21 are the independent claims herein. All of the independent claims were formerly dependent claims, but are now rewritten in independent form without any change in scope.

The newly added claims are all replacements for dependent claims that are being canceled herein. Specifically new claims 22-25 replace former claims 2-5, but now dependent on claim 6; new claims 26-29 replace former claims 9-12, but now dependent on claim 13; and new claims 30-33 replace former claims 16-19, but now dependent on claim 20.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over prior art teachings described in the present application, in view of Dennis et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,174,446.

Applicants respectfully traverse these claim rejections for reasons that are set forth below.

Claim 6 is directed to a “method”, which includes “receiving input from a user”. The method of claim 6 also includes the step, performed “in response to the input”, of “selecting one of a BCV (boot connection vector) pointer and a BEV (bootstrap entry vector) pointer to have a non-null value”. Claim 6 further specifies that the selecting step “includes changing the BCV pointer from a null value to a non-null value and changing the BEV pointer from a non-null value to a null value”.

In explaining his rejection of claim 6, the Examiner asserted that the prior art described in the present application teaches the last limitation of claim 6, namely, wherein selection of one of the BCV and BEV pointers to be non-null includes changing the BCV pointer from a null value to a non-null value and changing the BEV pointer from a non-null value to a null value. However, applicants respectfully contend that what is actually disclosed about the prior art in the present application does not support this assertion by the Examiner.

The most nearly pertinent portion of the present application is believed to appear at lines 19-24 of page 3. For convenience of reference, applicants now quote that passage in full:

The above-mentioned BIOS Boot Specification (BBS) provides that a device may be either a BCV device or a BEV device, but not both. More specifically, the BBS provides that a device cannot have both a non-null BCV and a non-null BEV. In other words, at least one of the BCV and the BEV must be null. With the advent of iSCSI (Internet SCSI) booting, a problem arises from this requirement of the BBS that BCV and BEV devices are mutually exclusive.

It is evident that this passage says nothing about changing the BCV pointer from a null value to a non-null value and changing the BEV pointer from a non-null value to a null value, nor that this be done as part of selecting one of the two pointers to be non-null. At most, this passage merely discloses that one of the two pointers must be non-null, not what steps to take in selecting one to be non-null. It follows that the prior art fails to teach one of the limitations of claim 6, and that the rejection of claim 6 should therefore be reconsidered and withdrawn.

These same remarks are also directly applicable to claims 13 and 20, and are applicable in substance to claims 7, 14 and 21. The latter three claims are sort of “mirror images” of claims 6, 13, and 20 in that claims 7, 14 and 21 recite that the selection of one of the BCV and BEV pointers to be non-null includes changing the BEV pointer from a null value to a non-null value and changing the BCV pointer from a non-null value to a null value. Clearly the above-quoted passage from the present application does not teach the latter limitation any more than it teaches the concluding limitation of claim 6. Applicants therefore submit that the rejections of all of the independent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

C O N C L U S I O N

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

July 25, 2007
Date

/Nathaniel Levin/
Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460